

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated November 6, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant has amended claim 1 as indicated above. Applicant believes that the amendment to the claims addresses the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-14, 16-17 and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Davies et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0002034).

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "...controlling to transmit the broadcast data packet to the external device through the transceiver without a request for a connection setup" which is not disclosed in the art cited by the Examiner.

Claim 1 recites:

"A wireless communication device capable of a **connectionless oriented broadcast** comprising:
a transceiver for transmitting and receiving data to and from an external device;
a synchronization information generator which generates synchronization information;

a broadcast data packet generator which generates a broadcast data packet containing broadcast information; and a controller for broadcasting the synchronization information through the transceiver and synchronizing to the external device, and then controlling to transmit the broadcast data packet to the external device through the transceiver without a request for a connection setup."

The Examiner asserts that Davies teaches the elements of claim 1. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Davies requires a connection in order to broadcast data. As discussed on page 3, para. 38, a 'pull' mode allows a user to set up a connection with a server 56. Further, as discussed in Davies page 4, paras. 43-44, a portable device is required to join, as a slave, a piconet administered by a beacon, as a piconet master. An inquiry allows a would-be slave to find a base station and issue a request to join the piconet. Davies indicates that the Bluetooth inquiry procedure has been proposed specifically to solve the problem of bringing together master and slave therefore, Davies proposes to piggy-back a broadcast channel on the inquiry messages issued by the master. Therefore, Davies discloses that an inquiry message issued by the base station has an extra field appended to them capable of carrying a user-defined payload which is used to carry broadcast information. See page 4, para. 50.

Therefore, Davies merely discloses the addition of an extra field to an inquiry message sent by a master and is not directed to connectionless broadcast as disclosed in the applicant's invention as claimed. Moreover, and contrary to the present invention, Davies requires an inquiry (connection setup) in order to broadcast data.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 9 and 17 recite similar subject matter, claims 9 and 17 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

III. Rejection of claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0002034) in view of Rankin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0081972). Claims 7 and 15 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1 and 9 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Rankin does not cure the deficiencies of Davies.

IV. Rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0002034) in view of Bluetooth Specification Version 1.0B (hereinafter "Bluetooth 1.0B"). Claim 18 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 17 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Bluetooth 1.0B does not cure the deficiencies of Davies.

V. New Claims

Applicant has added claims 25 and 26 to clarify the connectionless broadcast of the Applicant's invention. Claims 25 and 26 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, the art cited by the Examiner does not teach the elements of claims 25 and 26.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 10/687,750

Attorney Docket No. Q77420

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

Date: February 6, 2007